# Sick Woman 1AC

## <Quote>

There has been a slew of writing in recent years about how “female” pain is treated – or rather, not treated as seriously as men’s in emergency rooms and clinics, by doctors, specialists, insurance companies, families, husbands, friends, the culture at large. In a recent article in The Atlantic, called “How Doctors Take Women’s Pain Less Seriously,” a husband writes about the experience of his wife Rachel’s long wait in the ER before receiving the medical attention her condition warranted (which was an ovarian torsion, where an ovarian cyst grows so large it falls, twisting the fallopian tube). “Nationwide, men wait an average of 49 minutes before receiving an analgesic for acute abdominal pain. Women wait an average of 65 minutes for the same thing. Rachel waited somewhere between 90 minutes and two hours,” he writes. At the end of the ordeal, Rachel had waited nearly fifteen hours before going into the surgery she should have received upon arrival. The article concludes with her physical scars [are] healing, but that “she’s still grappling with the psychic toll – what she calls ‘the trauma of not being seen.’” What the article does not mention is race – which leads me to believe that the writer and his wife are white. Whiteness is what allows for such oblivious neutrality: it is the premise of blankness, the presumption of the universal. (Studies have shown that white people will listen to other white people when talking about race, far more openly than they will to a person of color. As someone who is white-passing, let me address white people directly: look at my white face and listen up.) The trauma of not being seen. Again – who is allowed in to the public sphere? Who is allowed to be visible? I don’t mean to diminish Rachel’s horrible experience – I myself once had to wait ten hours in an ER to be diagnosed with a burst ovarian cyst – I only wish to point out the presumptions upon which her horror relies: that our vulnerability should be seen and honored, and that we should all receive care, quickly and in a way that “respects the autonomy of the patient,” as the Four Principles of Biomedical Ethics puts it. Of course, these presumptions are what we all should have. But we must ask the question of who is allowed to have them. In whom does society substantiate such beliefs? And in whom does society enforce the opposite? Compare Rachel’s experience at the hands of the medical establishment with that of Kam Brock’s. In September 2014, Brock, a 32-year-old black woman, born in Jamaica and living in New York City, [she] was driving a BMW when she was pulled over by the police. They accused her of driving under the influence of marijuana, and though her behavior and their search of her car yielded nothing to support this, they nevertheless impounded her car. According to a lawsuit brought against the City of New York and Harlem Hospital by Brock, when Brock appeared the next day to retrieve her car she was arrested by the police for behaving in a way that she calls “emotional,” and involuntarily hospitalized in the Harlem Hospital psych ward. (As someone who has also been involuntarily hospitalized for behaving “too” emotionally, this story feels like a rip of recognition through my brain.) The doctors thought she was “delusional” and suffering from bipolar disorder, because she claimed that Obama followed her on twitter – which was true, but which the medical staff failed to confirm. She was then held for eight days, forcibly injected with sedatives, made to ingest psychiatric medication, attend group therapy, and stripped. The medical records of the hospital – obtained by her lawyers – bear this out: the “master treatment plan” for Brock’s stay reads, “Objective: Patient will verbalize the importance of education for employment and will state that Obama is not following her on Twitter.” It notes her “inability to test reality.” Upon her release, she was given a bill for $13,637.10. The question of why the hospital’s doctors thought Brock “delusional” because of her Obama-follow claim is easily answered: Because, according to this society, a young black woman can’t possibly be that important – and for her to insist that she is must mean she’s “sick.”

#### That was Hedva [[1]](#footnote-1)16.

## Part 1 the Invisible Bodies

#### The resolution asks us to discuss the value of a handgun ban as a political option. But that misses the point, our discourses should not be shaped around the value of varying political actions. Rather it should be questioning the value of the POLITICAL ITSELF. The attempt to discursively engage in issues through public and political action doesn’t work, it fails to recognize bodies that exist as invisible from the public sphere, Hedva [[2]](#footnote-2)2,

In late 2014, I was sick with a chronic condition that, about every 12 to 18 months, gets bad enough to render me, for about five months each time, unable to walk, drive, do my job, sometimes speak or understand language, take a bath without assistance, and leave the bed. This particular flare coincided with the Black Lives Matter protests, which I would have attended unremittingly, had I been able to. I live one block away from MacArthur Park in Los Angeles, a predominantly Latino neighborhood and one colloquially understood to be the place where many immigrants begin their American lives. The park, then, is not surprisingly one of the most active places of protest in the city. I listened to the sounds of the marches as they drifted up to my window. Attached to the bed, I rose up my sick woman fist, in solidarity. I started to think about what modes of protest are afforded to sick people – it seemed to me that many for whom Black Lives Matter is especially in service, might not be able to be present for the marches because they were imprisoned by a job, the threat of being fired from their job if they marched, or literal incarceration, and of course the threat of violence and police brutality – but also because of illness or disability, or because they were caring for someone with an illness or disability. I thought of all the other invisible bodies, with their fists up, tucked away and out of sight. If we take Hannah Arendt’s definition of the political – which is still one of the most dominant in mainstream discourse – as being any action that is performed in public, we must contend with the implications of what that excludes. If being present in public is what is required to be political, then whole swathes [portions] of the population can be deemed a-political – simply because they are not physically able to get their bodies into the street. In my graduate program, Arendt was a kind of god, and so I was trained to think that her definition of the political was radically liberating. Of course, I can see that it was, in its own way, in its time (the late 1950s): in one fell swoop she got rid of the need for infrastructures of law, the democratic process of voting, the reliance on individuals who’ve accumulated the power to affect policy – she got rid of the need for policy at all. All of these had been required for an action to be considered political and visible as such. No, Arendt said, just get your body into the street, and bam: political. There are two failures here, though. The first is her reliance on a “public” – which requires a private, a binary between visible and invisible space. This meant that whatever takes place in private is not political. So, you can beat your wife in private and it doesn’t matter, for instance. You can send private emails containing racial slurs, but since they weren’t “meant for the public,” you are somehow not racist. Arendt was worried that if everything can be considered political, then nothing will be, which is why she divided the space into one that is political and one that is not. But for the sake of this anxiety, she chose to sacrifice whole groups of people, to continue to banish them to invisibility and political irrelevance. She chose to keep them out of the public sphere. I’m not the first to take Arendt to task for this. The failure of Arendt’s political was immediately exposed in the civil rights activism and feminism of the 1960s and 70s. “The personal is political” can also be read as saying “the private is political.” Because of course, everything you do in private is political: who you have sex with, how long your showers are, if you have access to clean water for a shower at all, and so on. There is another problem too. As Judith Butler put it in her 2015 lecture, “Vulnerability and Resistance,” Arendt failed to account for who is allowed in to the public space, of who’s in charge of the public. Or, more specifically, who’s in charge of who gets in. Butler says that there is always one thing true about a public demonstration: the police are already there, or they are coming. This resonates with frightening force when considering the context of Black Lives Matter. The inevitability of violence at a demonstration – especially a demonstration that emerged to insist upon the importance of bodies who’ve been violently un-cared for – ensures that a certain amount of people won’t, because they can’t, show up. Couple this with physical and mental illnesses and disabilities that keep people in bed and at home, and we must contend with the fact that many whom these protests are for, are not able to participate in them – which means they are not able to be visible as political activists.

#### And put away your generic state good turns, they don’t apply. My criticism is not of the existence of the state but rather it is a criticism of the concept of the Public Sphere as being one in which we solve. Also functions as terminal defense to any 1NC alternative utilizing a political methodology, they only produce more violence.

#### We construct “health” as a method of excluding bodies that deviate from this norm. This form of forgetting allows systemic exclusion to go unnoticed. We group the invisible as deviant and unworthy for engagement, this process disables all who deviate from the pre-conceived “normal”, Hedva [[3]](#footnote-3)3,

Ann Cvetkovich writes: “What if depression, in the Americas, at least, could be traced to histories of colonialism, genocide, slavery, legal exclusion, and everyday segregation and isolation that haunt all of our lives, rather than to be biochemical imbalances?” I’d like to change the word “depression” here to be all mental illnesses. Cvetkovich continues: “Most medical literature tends to presume a white and middle-class subject for whom feeling bad is frequently a mystery because it doesn’t fit a life in which privilege and comfort make things seem fine on the surface.” In other words, wellness as it is talked about in America today, is a white and wealthy idea. Let me quote Starhawk, in the preface to the new edition of her 1982 book Dreaming the Dark: “Psychologists have constructed a myth – that somewhere there exists some state of health which is the norm, meaning that most people presumably are in that state, and those who are anxious, depressed, neurotic, distressed, or generally unhappy are deviant.” I’d here supplant the word “psychologists” with “white supremacy,” “doctors,” “your boss,” “neoliberalism,” “heteronormativity,” and “America.”

#### This also means the 1AC functions as a starting point discussion for other modes of understanding power relations, since all other literature assumes a non-disability starting point.

## Part 2 the Vulnerable Bodies

#### Sick Woman Theory is a call for recognition. A call for vulnerability. It is a rallying cry for the invisible and a method of engagement for the visible, it is an all-encompassing method of relational understandings between agents, it is a resistance against the very world that makes us sick, Hedva [[4]](#footnote-4)4,

Sick Woman Theory is for those who are faced with their vulnerability and unbearable fragility, every day, and so have to fight for their experience to be not only honored, but first made visible. For those who, in Audre Lorde’s words, were never meant to survive: because this world was built against their survival. It’s for my fellow spoonies. You know who you are, even if you’ve not been attached to a diagnosis: one of the aims of Sick Woman Theory is to resist the notion that one needs to be legitimated by an institution, so that they can try to fix you. You don’t need to be fixed, my queens – it’s the world that needs the fixing. I offer this as a call to arms and a testimony of recognition. I hope that my thoughts can provide articulation and resonance, as well as tools of survival and resilience. And for those of you who are not chronically ill or disabled, Sick Woman Theory asks you to stretch your empathy this way. To face us, to listen, to see. Sick Woman Theory is an insistence that most modes of political protest are internalized, lived, embodied, suffering, and no doubt invisible. Sick Woman Theory redefines existence in a body as something that is primarily and always vulnerable, following from Judith Butler’s work on precarity and resistance. Because the premise insists that a body is defined by its vulnerability, not temporarily affected by it, the implication is that it is continuously reliant on infrastructures of support in order to endure, and so we need to re-shape the world around this fact. Sick Woman Theory maintains that the body and mind are sensitive and reactive to regimes of oppression – particularly our current regime of neoliberal, white-supremacist, imperial-capitalist, cis-hetero-patriarchy. It is that all of our bodies and minds carry the historical trauma of this, that it is the world itself that is making and keeping us sick.

#### And put away your intersectionality critique, yes the 1AC is a focus on disability but the Sick Woman applies to any body excluded from the social realm. It’s an analysis of the disabling effects of invisibility.

#### The Sick Woman is a method of empowerment, a method of engaging particularities of experiences while still providing a rallying cry to the un-cared for, Hedva [[5]](#footnote-5)5,

To take the term “woman” as the subject-position of this work is a[n] strategic, all-encompassing embrace and dedication to the particular, rather than the universal. Though the identity of “woman” has erased and excluded many (especially women of color and trans and genderfluid people), I choose to use it because it still represents the un-cared for, the secondary, the oppressed, the non-, the un-, the less-than. The problematics of this term will always require critique, and I hope that Sick Woman Theory can help undo those in its own way. But more than anything, I’m inspired to use the word “woman” because I saw this year how it can still be radical to be a woman in the 21st century. I use it to honor a dear friend of mine who came out as genderfluid last year. For her, what mattered the most was to be able to call herself a “woman,” to use the pronouns “she/her.” She didn’t want surgery or hormones; she loved her body and her big dick and didn’t want to change it – she only wanted the word. That the word itself can be an empowerment is the spirit in which Sick Woman Theory is named. The Sick Woman is an identity and body that can belong to anyone denied the privileged existence – or the cruelly optimistic promise of such an existence – of the white, straight, healthy, neurotypical, upper and middle-class, cis- and able-bodied man who makes his home in a wealthy country, has never not had health insurance, and whose importance to society is everywhere recognized and made explicit by that society; whose importance and care dominates that society, at the expense of everyone else. The Sick Woman is anyone who does not have this guarantee of care.

#### A focus on particularity is key, abstractions make solvency impossible because they ignore key features of existence necessary for understanding the perspective of the un-cared for, Mills[[6]](#footnote-6),

But though **particularism (in this group-based form) responds to a real problem**, its solution arguably results from a faulty diagnosis. **Dominant abstractions may indeed be remote,** dominant principles may indeed be unhelpful, dominant categories may indeed be alienating; **but this lack of ﬁt between generality and one’s experience** (the maleness and whiteness of the supposedly general, genderless, and colorless view from nowhere)arguably **arises not from abstraction and generality** per se**, but an abstraction and generality that abstract[s] away from gender and race. The problem is that they are deﬁcient abstractions of the ideal-as-idealized-model kind**, not that they are abstractions tout court**. What one wants are abstractions of the ideal-as-descriptive-model kind that capture the essentials of the situation of [the oppressed] women and nonwhites**, not abstract away from them. Global **concepts like patriarchy and white supremacy** arguably **fulﬁll this role**, as Marxism’s class society/capitalism did (however inadequately for non-class oppressions) for earlier generations**. These terms are abstractions that do reﬂect the speciﬁcities of group experience,** thereby potentially generating categories and principles that **illuminate** rather than obfuscate **the reality of different kinds of subordination.**

#### This also takes out your blanket modes of solvency, an understanding of particularities is key. Specifically, the affirmation of existence through vulnerability produced by the 1AC is uniquely key, it challenges dominant modes of knowledge production and allows an esteeming of all bodies and their inherent vulnerability, Campbell in 03[[7]](#footnote-7),

**Our discussion engages the imagination by playing** dangerously(yet cautiously) **with maters of ‘disability ‘**desire’, ‘pride’, ‘culture’ and a transgressive aesthetic. It is a vulnerable conversation, a speaking otherwise about ‘disability’. **By adopting the ‘thought of the outside’ (**as expressed by Foucault, 1988, Orig 1966) **and repositioning our gaze it maybe possible to open up ‘spaces’ for** oppositional technologies **of self that posit ‘disability’ as a positive erotic, grounds for subjugated celebratory experiences of ‘disability’.** As Cheryl Wade puts **“what is missing [is].. a true esteeming of the** Cripple **[disabled] body”** (1994: 35). In this sense, Chapter Seven turns a corner in the dissertation by marking out sites of resistance to technologies of ableism.

## Part 3 the Call for Recognition

#### Our advocacy is that the judge should endorses the 1AC’s performance of Sick Woman Theory as a method of recognizing and giving voice to the social invisible.

#### The role of the judge should be an educator whose job is to challenge dominant ableist mindsets that construct and exclude bodies as invisible, Beckett in 2013[[8]](#footnote-8),

#### Serious and systemic disability discrimination provides powerful justification for¶ disability-focused anti-oppressive pedagogy (Beckett 2009), but such pedagogy is also¶ critical to the development of a more ‘innovative and aggressive conception of¶ inclusive education’ (Slee 2011, i). If inclusive education is to help build an inclusive¶ society (Armstrong and Barton 2008), then in addition to meaningful inclusion of¶ disabled students within mainstream settings (itself, likely to do much to challenge¶ disability), schools’ teaching and learning strategies must challenge disability as a¶ form of oppression.¶ Proposed here is a form of ‘inclusive pedagogy’, but not as currently understood.¶ Inclusive pedagogy is usually defined in terms of rethinking curricula and teaching¶ practices to include everyone (Florian and Black-Hawkins 2011). This is vital and a¶ prerequisite for the anti-oppressive pedagogy proposed herein: inclusion, in all¶ regards, being ‘a prerequisite of a democratic education’ (Slee 2011, i).¶ The connection between ‘inclusive’ and ‘democratic’ education, although well¶ established, has been reworked by authors in ‘Disability Studies in Education’¶ (Danforth and Gabel 2006). For example, Goodley (2011) calls for dialogue between¶ critical pedagogy and disability politics. To this end, Baglieri and Shapiro (2012),¶ Gabel and Connors (2009) and Ware (2002) suggest incorporating Disability Studies¶ into the curriculum within US schools. Overall, this work implies that strategies¶ encouraging/supporting students to challenge disability as one form of oppression¶ ought to be part of education for all.¶ If non-disabled students are not encouraged to recognize and challenge disability¶ oppression, then as adults they may **reinforce** and legitimize **disabling ideas and practices** (Rieser and Mason 1990). Disabled students need to be supported to¶ recognize and understand the nature of their oppression and acquire skills to resist¶ this (Mason 1990). Arguably, they also need to be included in such initiatives because¶ relationships between disabled people can be marked by oppression (Wendell 1996).¶ We need to view all students as potentially having a ‘foot in both camps’ i.e.¶ ‘oppressed’ and ‘privileged’.

#### This is the only alternative. Any other method only delays relevant discourse and denies the possibility of solving, recognition of the 1ACs discourse of giving visibility to those rendered invisible is key, Evans et al in 12,[[9]](#footnote-9)

Lack of community discussion is neither random nor power-neutral. We have tried to have discussions. These discussions have been regularly derailed—in “wrong forum” arguments, in the demand for “evidence,” in the unfair burdens placed on the aggrieved as a pre-requisite for engagement. Read the last ten years of these discussions on edebate archives: Ede Warner on edebate and move forward to Rashad Evans diversity discussion from 2010 to Deven Cooper to Amber Kelsie’s discussion on CEDA Forums and the NDT CEDA Traditions page. We have been talking for over a decade, we have been reaching out for years, we have been listening to the liberal, moderate refrain of “we agree with your goals but not with your method.” We will no longer wait for the community to respond, to relinquish privilege, to engage in authentic discussion, since largely the community seems incapable of producing a consensus for responding to what “we all agree” is blatant structural inequity. It seems that meta-debates/discussions about debate are generally met with denial, hostility and—more often—silence. This silence is in fact a focused silence**.** It is not people in the Resistance Facebook group that comprise these silent figures—it is (as has been described) “the old boys club.” We have been quite vocal—and we believe that it is this very vocalness (and the development of a diversity of tactics in response to status quo stalling tactics) that has provoked response when response was given. Sarah Spring’s cedadebate post is a case in point. The decision to change our speaker point scale is not in order to produce a “judging doomsday apparatus” (this kind of apocalyptic rhetoric might more aptly be applied to the current racist/sexist/classist state of affairs in this community), though we must admit that we are flattered that our efforts have affected the community enough to result in such a hyberbolic labeling. **It** indicates that civil disobedience is still an effective tactic; the debate community should take it as an indication that our calls for change are serious. We will continue to innovate and collaborate on tactics of resistance. This “crisis” in debate has no end in sight. The rationale for changing the point scale was not simply to “reward” people for preferring the unpreferred critic. We recognize that MPJ produces effects, and we hoped that changing our point scale was a small but significant tactic that was available to the disenfranchised in this community. MPJ:

#### The role of the ballot is to endorse the debater who has the best methodology to exposing, understanding, and solving ableist mindsets.

#### The classroom is key- it is a starting point for embodied knowledges which skew our epistemic lenses making challenging ableist mindsets necessary to evaluate any other layer of the flow, Ervelles [[10]](#footnote-10)2K,

For example, critical theorists of education have begun to describehow **bodies are inscribed by** the **dominant cultural practices** of schools **through** a process that Peter McLaren has called **“**enfleshment**.” To be “**enfleshed**,”** McLaren explains**, is to be marked by discourses that** not only sit on the surface of the fleshbut **are,** on the other hand, **embedded in the flesh such that we learn “a way of being in our bodies**…that is we are taught to think about our bodies and how to experience our bodies.” **One context where students learn to experience their bodies is education,** where students learn the importance of disciplining their bodies so as not to distract from the “mental efforts” of the mind**. In an attempt to control these “**disruptive excesses**” of unruly bodies, schools have** elaborate **practices that support the rigid organization of classroom space** and time, the overriding emphasis on discipline, and the careful monitoring of the curriculum. **So entrenched are these practices that** Ursula Kelly has argued that **“education is the body and education territorializes the body” since “the notion of *mind/ing bodies* bespeaks** most accurately and succinctly **about how the intersection of** knowledge**, power**, anddesire **craft[s] [subjectivity] as the cultural project of schools.”**

#### And an analysis of invisibility is a prior question to any other form of discourse, understanding why bodies are excluded from discursive spaces is necessary to have meaningful dialogue to begin with, Boys in 08[[11]](#footnote-11),

This shifts the inquiry from representations (on the body, in the space) to relationships, processes and contexts. Any encounter is **necessarily** mediated by who is there, who is not, why they are there **(or why not), what they bring to the situation and what they take away.** Such events involve meanings-in-the-making through a process in space and over time. **Importantly** encounters are not just a space of sharing and recognition but also of conflict, differentiation and negotiation. They involve interpretations, talk, gestures, bodily relationships, and actions. **So how do encounters** work? **In each case we now have two questions which allow the exploration of disability beyond being a stereotypical marker of identity or difference. What embodied knowledge and experience do we the participants bring to the encounter? What are the routine social and spatial practices which frame the encounter?** Here, disabled and ‘non-disabled’ participants are not separated out; all have parity in the space of the encounter itself. But the impact of framing disabled people in ways not of their making remains central to the investigation. **As Davis write**s**:** Disability is not so much the lack of a sense or the presence of a physical or mental impairment as it is the reception and construction of that difference.

#### As a judge, you are an educator and have an obligation to protect students and make rounds inclusive – this is primarily a question of in round practices, Smith [[12]](#footnote-12)’13,

**“**It will be uncomfortable, it will be hard, and it will require continued effort but the necessary step in fixing this problem, like all problems, is the community as a whole admitting that such a problem with many “socially acceptable” choices exists in the first place. Like all systems of **social control**, the reality ofracism **in debate is constituted by** the singular **choices that** institutions, **coaches**, and students **make** on a weekly basis. I have watched countless rounds where competitors attempt to win by rushing to **abstractions** to **distance the conversation from the** material **reality** that black **debaters** are forced to **deal with every day.** One of the students I coached, who has since graduated after leaving debate, had an adult judge write out a ballot that concluded by “hypothetically” defending my student being lynched at the tournament. Another debate concluded with a young man defending that we can kill animals humanely, “just like we did that guy Troy Davis”. **Community norms** would **have competitors** do intellectual gymnastics or **make up rules to accuse** black **debaters of breaking to escape hard conversations** but as someone who understands that experience, **the only constructive strategy is to acknowledge the reality of the oppressed**, engage the discussion from the perspective of authors who are black and brown, **and** then find strategies to **deal with the issues at hand.** It hurts to see competitive seasons come and go and have high school students and judges spew the same hateful things you expect to hear at a Klan rally. **A student should not**, when presenting an advocacy that aligns them with the oppressed, **have to justify why oppression is bad. Debate is not just a game, but a learning environment with liberatory potential.** Even if the form debate gives to a conversation is not the same you would use to discuss race in general conversation with Bayard Rustin or Fannie Lou Hamer, that is not a reason we have to strip that conversation of its connection to a reality that black students cannot escape. Current **coaches** and competitors alike **dismiss concerns of** racism and **exclusion, won’t teach other students anything** about identity in debate **other than** how **to shut down** competitors who engage in **alternative** styles and **discourses**, and refuse to engage in those discussions even outside of a tournament setting. A conversation on privilege and identity was held at a debate institute I worked at this summer and just as any theorist of privilege would predict it was the heterosexual, white, male staff members that either failed to make an appearance or stay for the entire discussion. No matter how talented they are, we have to remember that the students we work with are still just high school aged children. **If those who are responsible for participants and** the creation of accessible **norms won't risk a better future** for our community, **it becomes harder to explain to students who look up to them why risking such an endeavor is necessary.”**

#### What we say here matters because debate has transformative potential and real world implications in several facets of life. If we allow these types of arguments and discourse allows debaters to go into the real world and engage in actual practices, Vincent [[13]](#footnote-13)13,

Until we re-conceptualize the speech and the speech act, and until judges are comfortable enough to vote down debaters for a performance that perpetuates violence in the debate space, **debaters and coaches** alike will **remain complacent in their privilege**. As educators we must begin to shift the paradigm and be comfortable doing this. As a community **we should stop looking at ourselves as isolated in a vacuum and recognize that the discourse and knowledge we produce in debate has real implications for how we think when we leave this space**. Our performances must be viewed as of the body instead of just by it. As long **as we continue to operate in a world where our performances are merely by bodies, we will continue to foster a climate of hostility and violence towards [minority] students of color, and** in turn destroy **the transformative potential this community could have.**

#### Debaters must be held accountable for the discourse they produce in round. Judge need to be active allies and engage in a process of disrupting the flow in light of a teachable moment, Vincent [[14]](#footnote-14)13,

**Debaters must be held accountable for the words they say in the round.** We should no longer evaluate the speech. Instead we must begin to evaluate the speech act itself. Debaters must be held accountable **for more than winning the debate. They must be held accountable for the implications of that speech.** **As educators and adjudicators in the debate space we** also **have an ethical obligation to foster an atmosphere of education. It is not enough for judges to offer predispositions suggesting that they do not endorse [oppressive] racist, sexist, homophobic discourse, or justify why they do not hold that belief, and still offer a rational reason why they voted for it. Judges have become complacent** in voting on the discourse, **if the other debater does not provide a clear enough role of the ballot framing, or does not articulate well enough why the racist discourse should be rejected.** Judges must be willing to foster a learning atmosphere by holding debaters accountable for what they say in the round. **They must be willing to vote against a debater if they endorse [oppressive] racist discourse. They must be willing to disrupt the process of the flow for the purpose of embracing that teachable moment. The speech must be connected to the speech act.** We must view the entire debate as a performance of the body, instead of the argument solely on the flow.

1. Johanna Hedva, xx-xx-xxxx, "Sick Woman Theory," Mask Magazine, http://www.maskmagazine.com/not-again/struggle/sick-woman-theory [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Johanna Hedva, xx-xx-xxxx, "Sick Woman Theory," Mask Magazine, http://www.maskmagazine.com/not-again/struggle/sick-woman-theory [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Johanna Hedva, xx-xx-xxxx, "Sick Woman Theory," Mask Magazine, http://www.maskmagazine.com/not-again/struggle/sick-woman-theory [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Johanna Hedva, xx-xx-xxxx, "Sick Woman Theory," Mask Magazine, http://www.maskmagazine.com/not-again/struggle/sick-woman-theory [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Johanna Hedva, xx-xx-xxxx, "Sick Woman Theory," Mask Magazine, http://www.maskmagazine.com/not-again/struggle/sick-woman-theory [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Charles W. Mills Ideal Theory as Ideology [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Fiona Anne Kumari Campbell, The Great Divide: Ableism and Technologies of Disability Production, 2003 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Beckett 13’- Angharad Anti-oppressive pedagogy and¶ disability: possibilities and challenges, School of Sociology and Social Policy, University of Leeds- [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. (Dr. Shanara Reid-Brinkley, Rashad Evans, et al Amber Kelsie and Jillian Martin, November 12th, 2012, “An Open Letter to Sarah Spring,” http://resistanceanddebate.wordpress.com/2012/11/12/an-open-letter-to-sarah-spring/))//gingE [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Educating Unruly Bodies: Critical Pedagogy, Disability Studies, and the Politics of Schooling, Nirmala Ervelles Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology Auburn University 2000 [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. (Jos, “challenging the 'normal': towards new conceptual frameworks”, <http://www.sowhatisnormal.co.uk/challenging>) [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. [“A Conversation in Ruins: Race and Black Participation in Lincoln Douglas Debate” By Elijah J. Smith 9/4/13.] [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Chris Vincent, October 26th 2013, Re-Conceptualizing our Performances: Accountability in Lincoln Douglas Debate)KJT/Wardn [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Chris Vincent, October 26th 2013, Re-Conceptualizing our Performances: Accountability in Lincoln Douglas Debate)KJT/Wardn [↑](#footnote-ref-14)